

Application Serial No: 10/624,171
In reply to Office Action of 6 December 2004

Attorney Docket No. 78906

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

As at the issuance of the above referenced Office Action there were 20 claims pending in the application. 13 claims were allowed, 7 claims were objected to. By this response claims 1 and 3 are amended.

The above reference Office Action objects to, and requires correction of claims 1 and 3 because of the following informalities: in claims 1 line 19, insert -electrode- after -second-and-third-. In claim 3, lines 3 and 5, it is not clear if applicant intends to claim a first or second magnetic assembly or a first or second magnet. Claims 2 and 4-7 are objected to for the same reason as claim 1.

These objections are respectfully traversed in view of these amendments and remarks.

With respect to the Examiner's requested correction in line 19 of claim 1, these changes have been made.

With respect to the Examiner's objection regarding lines 3 and 5 of claim 3 that it is not clear if applicant intends to claim a first or a second magnetic assembly or a first or second magnet, Applicant has rewritten the preamble to claim 3 in a manner eliminating reference to magnetic assembly. (Upon review, the Applicant is now aware that the term magnetic assembly is not a term used in the specification. The use of

Application Serial No: 10/624,171
In reply to Office Action of 6 December 2004

Attorney Docket No. 78906

"magnetic assembly" in the preamble of claim 3 was unintentional. Applicant believes rewritten claim 3 will "pass muster".

Claims 2 and 4-7 have been reviewed and it is believed that none of the corrections made in claims 1 and 3 require consequent correction(s) in these other claims.

Applicant respectfully suggest in view of these remarks that all grounds for objections have been removed by the foregoing amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are therefore earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone Michael F. Oglo, Attorney for Applicants, at 401-832-4736 if, in the opinion of the Examiner, such a telephone call would serve to expedite the prosecution of the subject patent application.

Respectfully submitted,
ROBERT C. HIGGINS

7 February 2005

By Michael F. Oglo
MICHAEL F. OGLO
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 20464